श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : अपने ही देश में अपनी ही राजभाषा का ..... (व्यवधान)

श्री सभापति आप लोग सब समझदार लोग हैं, आप लोग उसको हिंदी अंग्रेजी दोनों में समझते हैं और ... (**व्यवधान**) ।

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र (बिहार) : कम से कम आपकी तरफ से यह कह देना चाहिए कि अभी नहीं है । लेकिन यह परम्परा गलत है । इतना तो आप कहिए इतना कहिए कि सरकार गलत काम कर रही है । काम चले वह अलग बात है... (**व्यवधान**) मैं यह समझता हूं कि शासक पार्टी के लोग थपथपी लगाकर काम चला लेंगे लेकिन हम लोग जो बिना थपथपी वाले हैं उनको तो कुछ बोलने का भी अवसर मिल, सुन करके ।

SHRI VISHVJIT PRITHVIJIT SINGH (Maharashtra): Sir, never before has this happened. Every time there is a statement, copies are always distributed and they are always short. Nobody has ever complained. They are only doing this for your benefit, Sir, and also because the hon. Prime Minister is here. Believe me, Sir, this is a show. Don't take it seriously.

SHRI K. MOHANAN: This is an insinuation, Sir (*Interruption*).

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : सदस्य ने यह रिमार्क कस दिया, हाउस का कितना अनुभव है, पता नहीं है । अपनी अज्ञानता का परिचय दे देना उनके लिए महत्व रखता होगा । ... (**व्यवधान**)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let us carry on with our work. In future, I hope, they will see to it.

STATEMENT BY PRIME MINISTER
Implementation of Indo-Sri Lankan Agreement

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI RAJIV GANDHI): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to inform the House about progress on the implementation of the Indo-Sri Lankan Agreement, including the background to the operations of the Indian Peace Keeping Force (IPKF) in the Jaffna peninsula.

The Agreement has been acclaimed internationally. There is a widespread consensus that the full implementation of the Agreement will be of universal benefit. Tamil aspirations would be met, the unity and integrity of Sri Lanka preserved, and peace and stability restored to the region. Some of our important security concern would also be met. Therefore, the Government of India are committed to the full implementation of this Agreement. We believe that this resolve is shared by the Government of Sri Lanka.

In the three months since the Agreement was signed, we have made satisfactory progress on many fronts. Sri Lankan security personnel have stayed in their barracks, Home Guards in the Eastern Province have been disarmed and the Special Task Force has been largely withdrawn. Over 3,300 Tamil detenus have been released under an amnesty, and the rest would have been freed if the LTTE had not disrupted the return to normalcy.

The contours of civil administration in the North and the East were being drawn on lines suggested by Tamil representatives ranging from the LTTE to the TULF. The Interim Administrative Council had been announced, with the LTTE given a decisive majority share. The return of the refugees from India had been planned in consultation with the Government of Sri Lanka. We had identified priority areas for rehabilitation, to be financed through a grant of Rs. 25 crore announced by India. Peace had been established in the North and the East of Sri Lanka. The return to normalcy was imminent.

It is a matter of great regret that the LTTE threw away all this. They went back on every commitment they had given us. They deliberately set out to wreck the Agreement, because they were unable or unwilling to make the transition from

[Shri Rajiv Gandhi]

militancy to the democratic political process. The LTTE were given every possible encouragement and opportunity to join the political mainstream and even to play a leading role in the process. The LTTE leadership, which had masterminded the killings of over 600 rival Tamil militant cadres, were permitted to retain their personal arms for their own security. They were allowed to hand over their arms at their own pace, even though this enabled motivated parties to question our resolve to implement the Agreement. Our High Commissioner flew to Jaffna several times to find out what the LTTE leadership wanted. On September 28, an agreement was reached. The minutes signed conceded every single demand of the LTTE conserning the composition and functioning of the Interim Administrative Council. In return, the LTTE reiterated their support to the Agreement and once again promised to lay down arms. The establishment of the Interim Administrative Council was announced in accordance with this agreement. But within hours, the LTTE went back on their commitment.

The LTTE chose to adopt a course of violence. While they promised us support to the Agreement, they started a propaganda campaign against India and the Agreement through meetings and through their illegal broadcasting facilities. They organised disturbances in Jaffna, disrupting normal life and the process of reconstruction and rehabilitation. They threatened all Tamil civilians who disagreed with them. They hunted down and massacred about 100 members of other Tamil militant groups. They tried to inflame Tamil opinion in Jaffna by imposing an unnecessary and tragic fast unto death by one of their cadres to demand concessions that were already under discussion and were resolved to their satisfaction.

At this stage the unfortunate suicide of 12 LTTE cadres took place. The LTTE killed the eight Sri Lankan soldiers in their custody and massacred over 200 civilians in the Eastern Province. They publicly repudiated the Agreement and started armed attacks on the IPKF.

The LTTE's repudiation of the Agreement, their attacks on Sinhalas and Muslims in the East and their murder of Sri Lankan soldiers threatened to produce a Sinhala backlash that would have destroyed the Agreement and produce a cycle of violence worse than any the island had so far seen. The victims would have been mainly Tamils, especially in the South and the Central High lands.

The House will appreciate that this could not have been allowed to happen. In these circumstances, the IPKF were give instructions to apprehend anyone carrying arms or involved in the massacre of civilians. At this point, the LTTE launched attacks on the IPKF. There was then no alternative to disarming the LTTE.

The IPKF were given strict instructions not to use tactics or weapons that could cause major casualties among the civilian population of Jaffna, who were hostages to the LTTE. The Indian Army have carried out these instructions with outstanding discipline and courage, accepting, in the process, a high level of sacrifices for protecting the Tamil civilians. I place on record Government's very deep appreciation of the dedication and high moral standards with which the Indian Armed Forces have conducted their operations in Jaffna, against a group that flouts every norm of civilised behaviour, coercing old men, women and children to act as shields, using innocent children as human bombs, murdering prisoners, and booby-trapping houses of the people of Jaffna on whose behalf they claim to be fighting. We wish a speedy recovery to our wounded soldiers. I pay homage to the soldiers who have laid down their lives. I am sure the entire House will join me in conveying our tribute to our gallant armed forces and our deepest sympathies to the bereaved families.

Despite grave risk to IAF helicopters, emergency food supplies were air-dropped over the city even during the fighting. The IPKF shared their rations with the refugees in Jaffna, cooked food was sent to refugee camps as soon as these came under the IPKF's protection. We have

made a major effort to restore civil supplies, amenities and administration to Jaffna. Simultaneously, shiploads of essential food and other supplies have been sent to the port of Kankesanthurai. Relief convoys are being sent to Jaffna, even though the LTTE continues to attack these humanitarian missions. Electricity and telephone communications, which had been sabotaged by the LTTE, have been partially restored with equipment flown out from India to replace what had been damaged. A small team of civil administrators has been sent to advise and assist the IPKF in relief and rehabilitation work. The Indian Red Cross have sent over their personnel, and, in co-operation with the local Red Cross, they are doing a remarkable job of providing relief and medical assistance in the City.

The unfortunate developments in Jaffna were not of our making. We reacted with a heavy heart when there was no alternative. We got the LTTE everything they wanted, disregarding the cost to our credibility with other militant groups and all communities including the Tamils. We over looked the LTTE's vicious propaganda even before the outbreak of hostilities, not just against the Agreement but against India and the IPKF. In the Interim *Administrative Council, they were given* a clear majority of seven out of twelve, including a Chairman of their choice. Other Tamil militant groups were excluded at their insistence. While the Government of India have accomodated every concern of the LTTE, the LTTE have not honoured any of their commitments. Even after they attacked the IPKF and precipitated the hos-
5.00 P.M. tilities, we have repeatedly said that if the LTTE hand over their arms, support the Agreement and renounce the path of violence, they can still play an important role in the future democratic set up. President Jayewardene has already promised them amnesty again if they surrender their weapons and support the Agreement. The LTTE have responded only with ultimatums and renewed propaganda, spreading misinformation and lies aimed at tarnishing the image of India and our armed forces. We still hope that better sense will prevail.

Throughout we have worked towards ensuring an early and effective devolution of powers so that the legitimate aspirations of the Tamils are met and they can live in security, with dignity and honour as equal citizens of Sri Lanka. Even while trying to control the violence unleashed by the LTTE, we have been mindful of the need to ensure an early return of Sri Lankan Tamil refugees from India and the need to ensure that fresh colonisation of Tamil areas does not take place.

There were reports of Sinhala colonisation in the East even after the Agreement was signed. This naturally caused concern to the Tamils, particularly since large numbers of Tamils of the Province are still refugees, either in India or in the North. We have taken this up strongly with the Government of Sri Lanka to ensure that this does not happen. The Sri Lankan Government have agreed to the formation of a Monitoring Committee, consisting of all communities, to investigate complaints of fresh colonisation.

We are keen to ensure an early return of Sri Lankan refugees in India to their homes. The Government of Sri Lanka have also agreed to cooperate with us to facilitate the early return to their homes of Tamils who have been internally displaced. We hope the process will start soon.

Long-term peace in Sri Lanka will hinge on the devolution package. The Sri Lankan Government have already introduced legislation in their Parliament to amend their Constitution to provide for the creation of Provincial Councils and the devolution of powers to them. The legislation also provides for the creation of a single Tamil province in the North and the East. In the light of Sri Lankas' unitary constitution, this legislation is unprecedented. The powers it seeks to devolve on the Provincial Councils are considerable. However some of its provisions do not fully meet Tamil expectations.

[Shri Rajiv Gandhi]

This matter was discussed extensively with President Jayewardene in Kathmandu and during his three day working visit to Delhi. We have received firm assurances that if, over the coming months difficulties arise the Sri Lanka Government will make such changes as are found necessary.

The Government of India believe that, despite some problem and delays many of which were foreseen but unavoidable in the resolution of an issue of this magnitude and complexity, this Agreement represents the only way of safeguarding legitimate Tamil interests and ensuring a durable peace in Sri Lanka. Some have chosen to criticise the Agreement. None have shown a better way to meeting the elgitimate aspirations of the Tamils in Sri Lanka restoring peace in that country and of meeting our own security concerns in the region. We have accepted a role which is difficult but which it is in our national interest to discharge. We shall not shirk our obligations and commitments. This is a national endeavour. I am confident our efforts will have the full support of the House.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As a special dispensation I have permitted hon. Members to seek clarifications. Although we are discussing the situation in Sri Lanka as a short duration discussion on Wednesday, I would request the Members to ask briefly pointed clarifications.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): Mr. Chairman, Sir I am mindful of the limitations that you place upon us. If I might remind you, earlier in the morning when discussion took place on this particular subject in your chamber, we were informed that the statement that would be coming forth from the Government would be on the specific aspect of the talks that were held between the Government and President Javewardene during his stay in Delhi. However, *suo motu* the Prime Minister has chosen to expand the scope of the statement that he has made and he has chosen to term it as a kind of a progress report on the Indo-Sri Lanka Agreement. Now, therefore, mindful of the fact that on Wednesday we are discussing the Indo-Sri Lanka Agreement, it would have been only fair if we were told that the Government is going to come forward with the policy statement, a progress report on the vexed question of Sri Lanka. However, we in exercise of our right as Members of the Rajya Sabha would be limited only to pointed questions, in which case we would have submitted to you, perhaps, the Government could have delayed making such *suo motu* statement as well until actually the debate is to take place. However, having registered this point, Sir, and mindful again of what you are saying....

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Come to the point. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I am letting them....

MR. CHAIRMAN: You come to the point and seek clarification.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I think it is prudent, Sir, and a just disposal of the political ire that we feed on the shambolic of the mishandling of the total Sri Lankan situation by our Government and mindful agin of the limitations that you have placed upon us and to the fact that on Wednesday a full-fledged debate is to take place....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Kindly seek your clarification. What is the point you want to ask?

MR. JASWANT SINGH: Sir, I have four specific questions. President Jayewardene during his press conference in New Delhi recently stated that the State of Tamil Nadu had assisted the LTTE with armaments and why I refer to this is that it is both symptomatic and ironic that two-thirds of the Prime Minister's statement is a diatribe against LTTE and not a progress report on what has actually taken place in Sri Lanka.

SHRI VITHALBHAI MOTIRAM PATEL (Gujarat): He has said this before the Accord.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Indeed before the Accord and subsequently he now supports the Accord, I think that actually underlines the point of he supply of armaments. It does not dispute it. Therefore, I would like the hon. Prime Minister to clarify because this is admittedly a very serious charge both against India and also against the Government of Tamil Nadu. How did the state of Tamil Nadu come into possession of significant military hardware and how it could it distribute that to the LTTE without either the knowledge of or the concurrence of the Government of India.

(b) If, however, that President Jayewardene is saying is wrong and his allegation is incorrect and what he is saying is false, then, why has not the Government of India or the Government of Tamil Nadu not come forward with a formal official rebuttal of this very serious allegation against India?

(c) If Tamil Nadu did not actually give the armaments, then, somebody assuredly did because one of the principal tasks which was given to the IPKF, indeed which constitutes one of the clauses of the Agreement is that within 72 hours LTTE would be disarmed. If neither the Tamil Nadu or no other agency in the South gave arms to the LTTE then who was this major destabilising foreign hand which gave arms to the LTTE and surely, this is our right to know and the Government should no hesitate to come forward with this particular name.

(d) So far as disarming the LTTE is concerned, whereas there was a specific, express provision that the LTTE shall be disarmed within 72 hours, why was that not done within 72 hours and because of that the Peace Keeping Force has suffered casualties and it is precisely because of that that the Prime Minister has to devote two-thirds of his statement merely accusing the LTTE. My second clarification, Sir, President Jayewardene ....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Complete it quickly.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I am asking very pointedly and very specifically.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Make them short also.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I will make them very short also. My second clarification is—President Jayewardane just before his departure from Delhi stated, if I am not mistaken, words to the effect that he is entirely satisfied with the talks. As for our Government, speaking through the Prime Minister it expressed its position more reservedly by saying words to the effect that certain issues need to be clarified. Now, there is, in these two statements a significant discord. Therefore, I would like the hon. the Prime Minister to explain to the House what are these particular issues that need to be clarified about which President Jayewardene has expressed entire satisfaction.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Make it short because we will get time day after tomorrow to discuss it.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I will make it very short, Sir. The Indian Armed Forces, for the first time in our political history are under the political control of a foreign Government. The Sri Lankan President has repeatedly asserted so. This is highly unsatisfactory but this is one of the gifts of the architect of the "agreement of the Century." Would, therefore, the hon'ble Prime Minister clarify if the tenure of the Indian armed forces in Sri Lanka is to be determined by the will of the President of Sri Lanka, then for how long are you going to permit this political control of the Indian Army, the Indian Air Force and the Indian Navy and leave it in foreign hands?

Finally, Sir, our Government has repeatedly asserted and the Agreement which should really be called Rajiv Gandhi Jayewardene Agreement and not Indo-Sri Lankan Agreement as our Prime Minister has repeatedly asserted that the Government is speaking, negotiating on

[Shri Jaswant Singh]

behalf of Tamil groups. I would request the hon. the Prime Minister to inform the House, therefore, when, how and which Tamil group authorised the Government of India, and by what process, to negotiate on their behalf with the Sri Lankan Government, more particularly as the President of Sri Lanka refers to the TULF as insignificant and the LTTE as murderers? Thank you.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, Sir, when the hon. Prime Minister announced the Indo-Sri Lanka Accord in the Parliament, he called the occasion as the hour of glory for India. I do not know whether we still call it an hour of glory today or whether it is an hour.... (*Interruptions*). Let me complete. The Prime Minister will reply. He is capable of replying. In my view, it is an hour of shame and betrayal.

My first question is: the Prime Minister said that the terms of agreement were accepted by all. Is it not a fact that powerful group, the LTTE, did not agree to the terms of agreement and the Government of India coerced, intimidated and prevailed upon them, whatever you may call it, to agree? My second question is this. In this House, the Prime Minister and other Government leaders repeatedly said that India was not mediating in Sri Lankan internal affairs, it was not even negotiating on behalf of anybody, it was only using its good offices. What made the Government of India to change that stand and become a direct party to the agreement, become a direct signatory, and to agree to do the dirty work of Jayewardene, which he could not do on his own or with foreign help? Did you not set up a precedent by undertaking the responsibility of law an order in another country.

Thirdly, is it not a fact that American pressure was behind this agreement? This is the.... (*Interruptions*) Please have some patience. This is the publication of the Sri Lankan Embassy, Sri Lankan Newsletter. In this, an interview given by Mr. Jayewardene to "the South Magazine" is published. One sentence in the interview is very important and I quote: "The U.S. would no. lift a finger to help me without first consulting India."

Coming to the next question, clause 2.16(C) of the Accord says, "In the event that the Government of Sri Lanka requests the Government of India to afford military assistance to implement these proposals the Government of India will co-operate by giving to the Government of Sri Lanka such military assistance as and when requested." Does it imply that the Government of India will go to any extent to implement the provisions of the Accord or go to a full scale war in a foreign country? What right does the Government of India or the Prime Minister have got to commit Indias armed forces in this misadventure and unpopular task, in a foreign country resulting in the killing of thousands of our jawans there? What right have they got to commit the country to such a misadventure?

My next question is this. The problem has taken a turn from bad to worse with the suicide of twelve LTTE men. The Indian Peace Keeping Force and our High Commissioner there knew that they were threatening to commit suicide if handed over to the Sri Lankan forces. Why then the Peace Keeping Force allowed those men to be handed over to the Sri Lankan forces and they were being taken to Colombo?

The next question, we have been repeatedly telling that there were no civilian casualties. Will the Prime Minister tell us what exactly is the number of civilian casualties in these operations?

Sir, the next question is, though the LTTE... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please be short. They are not questions.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: We are seeking clarifications.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM (Tamil Nadu): We must take a context in which we put the questions.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENRA: I am not irrelevant. I am putting pointed questions. Why did the Peace Keeping Force and the Government of India refuse the repeated offers of cease-fire from the LTTE insisting that they should agree to the terms of the accord and must agree to the implementation of it, instead of ordering cease-fire? Is it not a fact that Mr. Jayewardene did not budge an inch during the recent negotiations as is evident from his press conference and his TV interview and the Government of India has to perforce say that the discussions were cordial and happily concluded? In fact, it was a happy conclusion for Mr. Jayewardene and not to both the parties.

Last but one question. I want to ask a pointed question. What for did we go to Sri Lanka? Is it in aid of the Sri Lankan Government or in aid of the Tamils? And are we, by our operations, fulfilling the major objective of our going there? And are we keeping the Tamilians in a stronger position or in a weaker position when we leave? Finally, is it not a fact that while the Tamilians asked for the *abhaya hastam* of the Prime Minister, he put his *Bhasmaasura hastom* on their heads?

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SHRI K. C. PANT): Are these two examples of brevity that we have just seen?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: It is for the Chair to judge.

SHRI K. C. PANT: I am entitled to ask.....

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: But it is for the Chair to judge. And if the honourable Ministers keep on interfering and intervening, the brevity would get spread.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now Mr. Sukomal Sen.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN (West Bengal): Mr. Chairman, when I rise to make my comment on the Sri Lankan situation...

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have to seek clarifications; you have not to make your comments now.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN: I know, I will make my comments when it is taken up for discussion in next Wednesday and I will seek only clarifications now from the honourable Prime Minister. Three months back the situation was different. At that time the Sri Lankan forces were fighting the LTTE and Indian Government was sending relief supplies despite physical opposition from Sri Lankan Government. Now there is an agreement and our party also supported the agreement hoping that it will bring peace on the Sri Lankan soil. Now the situation has taken an opposite turn. Everyday there is a severe bloodshed. What is causing anguish to us -- I tell, to all the citizens of the country — is colossal bloodshed and loss of life is taking place on the Sri Lankan soil and that is the main point at issue. One Member has asked what the civilian casualties are. So many things are coming before the eyes of the people. Government should put the things across the table so that we know what is happening in Sri Lanka. When the agreement was signed we came to know from newspapers that our Prime Minister and the Government of India were holding discussions with the militant groups, the Tamil moderate groups, as also the LTTE. Now, what transpired between the Prime Minister and the Government of India, on the one hand, and the LTTE and others, should be put before the people very clearly. Did they agree to the points contained in this agreement, the agreement that was signed between the two Governments? If the LTTE had agreed to these points, why are they objecting to it now? It has been stated that there was an agreement between the two, with the Indian High Commissioner in Sri Lanka on one side. That is, according to this statement —"on September 28 an agreement was reached when our High Commissioner in Sri Lanka flew to Jaffna." What was the agreement? Between whom? On one side there was our High

[Shri Sukomal Sen]

Commissioner. Then who were there on the other side? It has been stated that the LTTE was not opposed to the composition and functioning of the interim Administrative Council, etc. Who signed the agreement on the other side? Why are they then opposing it? All these issues are important issues. We are fighting for the Tamil cause. Our jawans are laying down their lives. What is the attitude of the Tamil population in Sri Lanka towards the role played by IPKF? Are they accepting the role played by IPKF? Again, their sympathies lay with the LTTE. Has it been reversed? Has their sympathy been drawn towards the agreement, that is, the main agreement? Are they supporting it? It has been stated that the Government of India is taking relief measures and that Rs. 25 crores have been earmarked for rehabilitation and reconstruction. For whom? What is their attitude towards India? How do they consider Indian Army? Do they consider Indian Army as an aggressor or as a friend? That is the main issue. If we cannot win them politically, military victory does not mean anything. Military victory does not necessarily lead to political victory. The Government should try to win the Tamil population of Sri Lanka politically; they should also try to win the Sri Lankan population of that island so that India plays its role properly, so that India's role is appreciated by all concerned. Mr. Jayewardene, when he was in India,—even on earlier occasions was referring to a separate Tamil Nadu and India as if Tamil Nadu is different from India. He says Tamil Nadu Government was supporting the Tamil militants. Now, when the Prime Minister visited vancouver, on his return journey he visited the US also and he held discussions with MGR there. Mr. M. G. Ramachandran was consulted by the Prime Minister while Mr. Ramachandaran was there for treatment. Again, after Mr. Jayewardene came to India, Mr. Natwar Singh was sent to Madras for consultations with Mr. Ramachandran. I would like to know whether Mr. Ramachandran fully agreed with Mr. Rajiv Gandhi on this Indo-Sri Lankan accord and also with the policy which this Government is following in regard to Sri Lanka. Now, some Members have said that it is a Tamil issue and all that. It is not a Tamil issue; it is an Indian issue. It is an Indian issue and every Indian citizen is concerned about it. Now, what traspired between the Prime Minister and Mr. Ramachandran should be clarified fully because all these points are there.

My other point is that there were talks between Mr. Jayewardene and the Prime Minister in New Delhi and there are no details of the talks. What has transpired between the two? Now, the Bills that have been introduced in Sri Lankan Parliament have been okayed by their Supreme Court also except for two amendments. Now, that actually Mr. Jayewardene assured Mr. Rajiv Gandhi? After the war is over, peace has to be restored and for that, the full co-operation of the Jayewardene's Government is necessary. Without that they cannot do it . But we know that the Jayewardene's Government is a divided Government... (*Interruptions*)...I am sorry, I meant Jayewardene's Government. We know that the Jayewardene's Government is a divided Government. A part of it is opposed to the accord and they would try to sabotage it. It is Mr. Jayewardene's Government which is divided. A part of it has opposed the agreement and from the very beginning they have tried to sabotage it and have provided a lot of provocation to the LTTE. A lot of provocation came from there to the LTTE which also may be one of the reasons for their present role. All these things are there. So, I would like to know how Mr. Jayewardene is sure that he would overcome the division in his own Government and would be able to ensure the full implementation of the agreement. Without implementing the agreement, what is the use of the present bloodshed? I would like to know all these things from the honourable Prime Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Chitta Basu.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (West Bengal): Sir, in the statement that he has made the Prime Minister has been pleased to refer to the two Bills which have been introduced in the Sri Lankan Parliament. Now, my specific question to the Prime Minister for clarification is whether, during his discussions with President Jayewardene, they discussed certain issues arising out of those two Bills whether certain changes were sought for by him and if those changes were sought for by him, what the nature of the changes sought for was and whether the President of Sri Lanka responded to it and, if he did respond, what the nature of that response was.

Now, another question arising out of this is whether the proposed two Bills now being discussed or which have been introduced in the Sri Lankan Parliament incorporate all the proposals negotiated up to December 19 last and whether the Prime Minister has taken pains to analyse them and scrutinize them.

Another point for clarification is whether the Prime Minister had some talks with President Jayewardene regarding a proposal for a treaty of friendship between India and Sri Lanka. Now, the President, Mr. Jayewardene, is on record as having said publicly that the proposed treaty would have nothing to do with the local happenings in the North and the East which means that he wants to delink the happenings in the North and the East of Sri Lanka from the proposed treaty. I would like to know whether such a proposal was made by the President, Mr. Jayewardene, to our Prime Minister and, if so, what has been the reaction of the Government with regard to the proposal of President Jayewardene for a friendship treaty between the two countries.

My another point for clarification is this As the statement says, there have been changed circumstances because of, according to him, non-co-operation by the LTTE. This the burden of the statement. Now, in this context may I know from the honourable Prime Minister as to what would happen to the proposal for setting up of interim administrative councils? Who will carry on the administration during this period in those two areas? Who will conduct the elections? How will the proposed election be held? Will any referendum as per the Agreement be held? These points need to be clarified.

Coming to the last point, Mr. Jayewardene made certain remarks regarding the role of the Tamil Nadu Government and its Chief Minister in training and providing shelter to the mimlitants in the past. Now, he did make, according to me, these boservations deliberately and after giving full thought to the consequences about it. He says in the Press Conference in Delni on November 6th—I quote him:

> "One must have the courage to express one's views, irrespective of the time and place."

He further goes on to say:

> "If you have to find faul with the crucifixion of—Christ, do it at Jerusalem."

It means that he made these observations, knowing fully well that he was a guest on the Indian soil and he had got some obligation to India. He made some charges against the Government of India and certain remarks about the role played by the Tamil Nadu Government which is a part of India. Now, if that remark has been made, how do you respond to that? Does the Government consider it necessary to reply to this in a befitting manner and what would be the Prime Minister's and the Government's reaction to this?

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN (Tamil Nadu) Sir, I would be as brief and as pointed as the previous speakers while seeking clarifications.

Sir, I want to place on record that the Indo-Sri Lankan Agreement was an unparallelled, historic, achievement, not only in the history of this country but in the whole world. (*Interruptions*) I say this because it was the only way to end the brutal genocide of the Tamils without jeopardising the sovereignity of another

[Shrimati Jayanthi Natarajan]

Republic. This was the only way to demilitarise the ethnic conflict. Nobody has come across a better solution than this. The only reason why we ran into difficulty is that the LTTE reneged on every single commitment that the LTTE made and promised to uphold. In this background, I wish to seek clarifications.

One of the major fears of the Tamils is the vexed question of colonisation. The major concern arises out of the question of ownership of Crown lands. In this regard the concept of Central joint ownership of Crown lands, despite the fact that land is a devolved subject, is unacceptable to the Tamils because the Sri Lankan Government will use Crown lands for colonisation. This land is under the control of the Provincial Councils. The Crown land will be retained in the possession of the Central Government and the President of Sri Lanka has the right to deal with Crown land without reference to Provincial Council. Has there been any discussion with President Jayewardene with regard to the ownership of the Crown land, and has any progress been made to allay some of the fears in that respect Secondly, the Tamils find unacceptable the wide definition given to the concept of Inter-Provincial Irrigation and Land Development projects because this might also result in Sinhala colonisation of Tamil areas. They are going to follow what they call national ethnic ratio. The Tamils feel that under the guise of Inter-Provincial Irrigation and Land Development Project, Sinhalese will be brought to occupy major tracts of land in the Tamil-dominated areas. Have any talks been conducted in this regard and, if so, with what result?

Finally, Sir, apart from the call of Mr. Sivagnanam which has been widely discussed in this House, has there been any direct and unequivocal offer from the leaders of the LTTE, specially from Prabhakaran, saying that they will lay down their arms and requesting the Indian Government to call a ceasefire in Sri Lankan or is the call for ceasefire something which has come out of nothing?

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY (Karnataka): The statement by the Prime Minister is a total indictment of the LTTE and its role. I went through the statement carefully. He has said on page 2 that the LTTE deliberately set out to wreck the agreement because they were unable or unwilling to make the transition from militancy to the democratic political process. It is a very serious charge. Sir, I would like to know from the Prime Minister whether the LTTE was totally committed to the Accord at any stage, wheher his talks with the various groups, including the LTTE have been recorded and whether signatures have been obtained from various Tamil groups including the LTTE. If the LTTE has also committed itself to the Accord, I would like to know from the Prime Minister at what point of time the LTTE went back on the Accord and why. What were the reasons and compulsions which made the LTTE go back on its commitment. Sir, the Prime Minister has said in the statement that all the groups agreed and supported the Accord. Then why did the LTTE want to maintain militancy and jeopardise democratic political process?. Mr. Prabhakaran was the leader of the LTTE and he is even now the leader of the LTTE. I would like to know from the Prime Minister whether this kind of break, going back on the commitment or the Accord by the LTTE, suited the LTTE at all. Why did they go back on the commitment made? Is it not a fact that at no stage there was a written commitment of the LTTE to the Accord? Even if it was an oral commitment by the LTTE or by Prabhakaran on behalf of the LTTE, did not certain intervening events unset the whole thing which created suspicion in the minds of the LTTE? Is it not a fact, Sir, that when the LTTE was asked to give a panel of names to the Interim Administrative Council, there were some differences and the LTTE wanted to withdraw certain names at some stage and the LTTE was not permitted to withdraw those names? After all, what is the interest what is the purpose of the whole exercise? The purpose is to see that the settlement arrived at is implemented. If that was the purpose, why did not the Prime

Minister or Mr. Jayewardene in Sri Lanka agree for changes in the names? Secondly, why did not the Government of India prevent transporting the captured LTTE cadres to Colombo? They should have been taken to Jaffna, to their native places. Why were they allowed to be transported to Colombo? That again created a suspicion, a doubt in the mind of the LTTE. Next, Sir, why didn't the Government of India take steps to prevent the death of Dileepan? He was fasting for days. No effort was made by the Government of India or the Government of Sri Lanka to prevent his fast or break his fast. That escalated the situation.

Sir, the Government of India's earlier position was that the Government would only pay a friendly role, offer its good offices. When there was a demand by certain sections of the House here that there should be a military intervention—even many Opposition Members did not suggest that—the Government of India, the Prime Minister took the position, "no intervention on behalf of the Government of India; there cannot be a military solution to this problem. There has got to be a political solution, and we are only helping." What is the situation now? (*Interruptions*) I am concluding. Why are you impatient? The Government of India went to render relief in the first instance. Later on the relief became a peace-keeping role. And now it is a regular military intervention. There is a direct conflict between the Government of India Forces and the LTTE men. This was not a thing that was anticipated or expected.

Sir, I would like to know from the Prime Minister as to how long this Peace Keeping Force would remain in Sri Lanka. How long? Is it, as President Jayewardene said, as long as he wants, as long as it is necessary? Then, how long? Is it, at the disposal of the Government of Sri Lanka? Or, are we free to withdraw our Forces at any time? Thank you, Sir.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Chairman, Sir, this statement is nothing but an indictment on the betrayal and attack on the LTTE. Sir, in this House four years ago, Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi sitting there in that place declared that the goings on in Sri Lanka is genocide. Sir, it is tragic that after four years the same genocide is being committed by the Indian Army. Sir, my blood rushes to my temples that our own Army is going there and killing civilians.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Kindly seek clarifications.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: Who is killing civilians? (*Interruptions*).

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I take very strong exception to the word "genocide" being used in relation to our armed forces. (*Interruptions*).

MR. CHAIRMAN: You put your point. That is all.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: Sir, if genocide is not extermination of a race then what is the word in English language for that? It is genocide. It is happening. It is being done.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You will get time for that day after tomorrow. At this point you seek your clarifications.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: The accord has been described by Mrs. Jayanthi Natarajan as historic. Yes, it is, historic in reckless use of military might and it is army adventure at its worst. That is how I want to describe the accord.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is your point?

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: I am coming to that. Sir, Jayewardene has stated that Prime Minister, "Shri Rajiv Gandhi, is now collaborating with him." For what? For killing Tamils. I think he is right because Mr. Rajiv is collaborating with him in killings Tamils.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is your point of clarification?

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: I am coming to that, Sir. Mr. Gurupadaswamy has very clearly described the situation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is your point of clarification? What clarification do you want?

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: My first clarification is this, regarding the devolution package. Is JRJ going to honour his commitment as it is written in the accord? No. It does not appear like that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have made your point. You have sought your clarification.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: Sir, there is a news item saying that a certain clause of the Amendment Bill should be approved by the people at a referendum in addition to being passed by the two-thirds majority in Parliament. That means it won't passed. Then there is another news item, Sir, according to the demand of the TULF, they are not like LTTE, now they are very close to the Government, it is said that the provisions of the two Bills now being introduced in the Sri Lankan Parliament fall short of the hopes and aspirations of Tamils. Originally Jayewardene had agreed to create a single provincial council for the northern and eastern provinces constitutionally. He has now gone back. He now wants to create this through a presidential proclamation which can be revoked at any time. These are the fears of the moderates, the TULF.

I would like to know from the hon. Prime Minister what the real situation is, what the real position is.

Sir, the Prime Minister is stepping into the shoes of Jayewardene, who is an expert in the art of duplicity. He will outwit our Prime Minister. I will tell you frankly, Sir. I am just coming to the point. We are having the Indo-Soviet Treaty on Peace, Friendship and Co-operation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ask about Sri Lanka.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: Sir, when the Janata Party came to power, Mr. Gromyko rushed back to Delhi in hot summer and met Mr. Vajpayee and asked him about the future of the Treaty and Mr. Vajpayee cleared his doubts and told him, I think, that this treaty is approved by the people of India.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You ask about Sri Lanka.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: I would like to ask the Prime Minister, is this accord, the so-called historic accord, approved by the people of Sri Lanka? No. My question is that his own Prime Minister is against it, his number two, number three, number four, all, entire party, is against it. The opposition is against it. That is why I want to ask the hon. Prime Minister what will happen to the fate of this accord after JRJ, Don't mistake it because he has declared that he will not contest the elections again.

Secondly, when Mrs. Indira Gandhi created Bangladesh...

MR. CHAIRMAN: My only request to you is, let us not bring in Bangladesh or Soviet Union; otherwise, there is no end to it. You put your questions.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: When Mrs. Indira Gandhi created Bangladesh out of the erstwhile East Pakistan, one European diplomat declared, "here is a statesman who knows when to wage a war and when to stop it." You should have the statesmanship to know when to stop the war.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You say all this when you are speaking during the discussion. Now you only put your questions.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: We are waging a war. The so-called LTTE is on the run. He should be happy at it. It is not the time to stop the war... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI JAGESH DESAI (Maharashtra): I am on a point of order. Sir, after the Prime Minister made the statement, and some preliminary remarks were made, you allowed a Short Duration Discussion, and

you allowed Members to ask pointed questions only, and seek clarification from the Prime Minister. But this is just going on as a debate. As such, I request you to consider whether it is not a waste of time. because Prime Minister will reply today and again these points will be repeated during the Short Duration discussion.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: My last question is, Mr. Sivagnanam, the former Municipal Commissioner of Jaffna in a letter has asked for a ceasefire for 48 or 72 hours to lay down arms. I would like to know from the Prime Minister, when are you going to order for a ceasefire? Is it not enough to have seen so many Tamils killed? Do you want elimination of all Tamils? When are you going to declare a ceasefire?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Aladi Aruna. I hope he will stick to the points only.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM: I abide by what you say.

Sir, with deep distress and disappointment, I seek clarifications, through you, from the Government. The statement given by the hon. Prime Minister deliberately supresses the factual position prevailing in Sri Lanka today...(*Interruptions*)... alleging LTTE. At the same time it has failed to indicate how most of the Cabinet members of Jayewardene Government are working against this accord, how the JVP are violently working against this accord and how the opposition parties in Sri Lanka are working against this accord. Nothing has been mentioned about the non-cooperation of the people in Sri Lanka, in this statement. At the same time, unfortunately, our Prime Minister has not mentioned anything about the ceasefire appealed by our hon. Chief Minister. Our Chief Minister, Dr. MGR, while he was in New York, appealed to the Government of India to accept the ceasefire offered by the militant group. After his arrival in Madras, he immediately asked this Government to accept the ceasefire. The LTTE people are concerned about it; they are prepared to surrender arms within 48 hours... (*Interruptions*). Yes, they have said it. But our Government imposed another condition that they must accept the accord at gun point. Sir, it is unfair on the part of our Government, a democratic Government, to ask a foreign country group to accept the accord, at gun point. We have every right to persuade them because we have extended our moral support to them when they were engaged in their struggle. At the same time, we have no right to force them to accept the accord. If this Government does not know the art of persuasion, I will ask them to leave the matter to our Chief Minister, Dr. M.G.R. and I can assure the House that within 48 hours, he will succesfully complete the negotiations. I would like to know from the hon. Prime Minister, is the Government prepared to entrust the work to our Chief Minister, Dr. M.G.R.

Sir, wherever our Prime Minister speaks, the enthusiastically mentions that Jayewadene is committed to the implementation of the agreement. I am having the copies of the Bills introduced in the Sri Lankan Parliament. Would the Prime Minister explain to the House how the devolution of power has been incorporated in these Bills? Would he explain to the House how the merger of the northern and eastern provinces has been accepted in these two amending Bills? Sir, I would like to emphasise that the principles underlying the accord have not been accepted by Jayewardene. He is only indulging in some political gimmicks. That is why, while he was staying in Delhi as the son-in-law, of our country he spoke all nonsense. Our Prime Minister requested him to include some amendment in these two Bills but he did not agree. He declared to the Press that the two Bills would be passed as they are. My point is Jayewardene is himself working againt the accord. When he is himself acting against the accord, we kiss him. But when the militants oppose the accord we kill them. Is it fair on our part? Why is there such a discrimination? My point is that the Government of Sri Lanka is not co-operating with us in the implementation of the accord.

[Shri Aladi Aruna *alias* V. Arunachalam]

My second pont is, how long the peace keeping force will be allowed to continue in Sri Lanka? One of the Ministers has said that the force is there to ensure the implementation of the accord. But what does Jayewardene say? He says that it will remain there as long as he likes. This has been confirmed by our Prime Minister also. If this is the position, I would like to know whether the peace keeping force will remain in Sri Lanka till the accord is implemented or it is just there to carry out the commands of President Jayewardene.

Then, Sir, Jayewardene made certain allegations against our Chief Minister. I am thankful to the Prime Minister that he explained to Jayewardene that our Chief Minister has done his best in bringing about the accord and for its implementation. Even then, Jayewardene has not corrected himself. When asked about this, he said that he was referring to the pre-accord position. What does it mean? Does it mean that prior to the accord, our Chief Minister was giving money illegally? Does it mean that prior to the accord, our Chief Minister was giving arms to the militants? Does the Government of India accept this? I am frank. Whatever service we rendered, whatever help we gave, whatever aid we sanctioned, were all with the concurrence and co-operation and with the knowledge of the Central Government. Therefore, it is your prime responsibility to refute the allegations made by the Sri Lankan President. Unfortunately, you have not done it. I am glad, at least now, the Prime Minister refuted the allegations. Thank you.

6.00 P.M.

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र (बिहार) : मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी से जानना चाहूंगा कि या तो तमिलनाडु के मुख्य मंत्री के जरिए या दूसरे किसी के जरिए डायरेक्टली या इनडायरेक्टली एल० टी० टी० ई० की तरफ से कोई सीजफायर की प्रोपोजल आई है या नहीं ? क्योंकि अखबार में बहुत सी बातें आई हैं । मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि गवर्नमेंट के पास ऐसी कोई बात है या नहीं ? अगर है तो गवर्नमेंट का उसके प्रति क्या रिएक्शन है ? यह पहला प्वांन्ट जानना चाहता हूं ।

दूसरा यह है कि हमारे मित्र जसवंत जी ने कहा कि किसने वहां इतने हथियार दिए उनको । मैं इसमें एक बिन्दू और जोडना चाहता हूं क्योंकि मैं समझता हूं एव० टी० ली० ई० के एन्टी इंडिया एक्शन के चलते ऐसी स्थिति पैदा हो गयी है इसलिए यह जानना चाहता हूं कि इतने बडे पैमाने पर ट्रेनिंग किसने दी ? यह कहां से हुआ कि इतनी ट्रेनिंग उनको मिली और हमारे पड़ोसी देश में इतने बडे पमाने पर हथियार जमा किए गए ? प्रधान मंत्री जी कम से कम इस बात को स्पष्ट कर दें ।

तीसरा इससे जुडता हुआ एक और प्रश्न है कि अगर हम अपनी फौज नहीं भेंजते तो क्या यह सच बात है कि श्रीलंका के प्रेजीडेंन्ट पाकिस्तान और इजराइल से भी ऐसी फौज मंगा कर वहां भारत विरोधी एक अड्डा बनना चाहते थे ? क्या हमारी सरकार के पास ऐसी कोई सूचना है या सिर्फ अखबारों में यह बात आ रही है ?

चौथी बात मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि अगर हमारी फौज वहां गई भारतीय मूल के निवासियों की मदद करने, अनफार्चूनेटली हो यह गया कि जिनकी मदद करने के लिए हम गये उन्ही की हत्या करने लगे, इस परिस्थिति में हम सरकार से जानना चाहते हैं कि अगर भारतीय सेना हट जाये तो जिस प्रकार से श्रीलंका की सेना भारतीय मूल के लोगों पर अत्याचार करती थी, हत्या करती थी वैसा तो कहीं-नहीं होने लगेगा ? कहीं क्या इसकी कोई सम्भावना यह सरकार सोचती है या नहीं ? मुझे इसकी सम्भावना शुरू दिन से है कि हम वहां जाकर कहीं फंस न जांयें । इस सम्बन्ध में मंत्री जी से भी मैंने कहा था कि हम और हमारा दल इस समझौते के पक्ष में हैं लेकिन फिर भी ऐसी विचित्र स्थिति पैदा हो गयी है जिसके चलते यह जानना जरूरी है ।

अंतिम प्रश्न यह है कि हम कब तक जल्दी से जल्दी अपनी फौज को वहां से वापस

लाने की स्थिति में आ जायेंगे ? इसका कोई अंदाजा सरकार ने लगाया है ? क्योंकि हमारे तमिलनाडु भाईयों का उनसे ब्लड रिलेशन है इसलिए उनकी प्रतिक्रिया ज्यादा जोर की होना स्वाभाविक है । वैसे हम सबकी प्रतिक्रिया उनसे कोई कम जोर की नहीं है । पर हम इतना ही ध्यान रखना चाहते हैं कि कहीं दूसरे साम्राज्यवादी राष्ट्र के एजेंट हमारे निकट आकर कहीं हमारे खिलाफ तो ऐसी साजिश नहीं कर रहे हैं । इन बिन्दुओं पर अगर प्रधान मंत्री ज देश के लोगों पर विश्वास नहीं करते, स्पष्ट ढंग से नहीं बताते तो बहुत खतरनाक स्थिति हो जाएगी क्योंकि सारा देश चिन्तित है कि आखिर यह क्या हो रहा है । इन्हीं प्रश्नों के साथ में प्रधान मंत्री जी से सफाई चाहता हूं ।

श्री शरद यादव (उत्तर प्रदेश) : धन्यवाद सभापति जी । मैं सिर्फ दो सवाल ही इस बारे में पूछना चाहता हूं । मान्यवर, मैं आपको धन्यवाद इसलिए देना चाहता हूं कि आपने मुझे समय दिया ।

जिन लोगों के लिए और जिन लोगों के बचाव के कारण यह हो रहा है और पड़ौसी राष्ट्र होने के कारण मैंने प्रधान मंत्री जी का बयान पूरा पढ़ा । उसकी मंशा भी पढ़ी । उसकी मंशा यह है कि बाजू में राष्ट्र है उसमें जो भारत के मूल लोग हैं उनकी रक्षा के लिए हमारी सरकार रुचि रखती है लेकिन बगल में श्रीलंका के जयवर्धने को छोड़ कर क्या और कोई नहीं है ? (व्यवधान) मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि तमिलनाडु के लोग उस इलाके में ज्यादा रहते हैं । वहां भी दो बड़ी पार्टियां हैं । उन बड़ी पार्टियों के लोगों ने इसी सदन में आज सुबह काफी कुछ कहा । मैंने देखा गोपालसामी जी कभी मर्यादा के बाहर नहीं जाते थे । लेकिन आज गोपालसामी जी ने बड़े पैमाने पर मर्यादा से बाहर जाने का काम किया । मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी से कहना चाहता हूं कि .....

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN (Tamil Nadu): The leader of the Anna-DMK who spoke just now is Shri Aladi Aruna and not Shri Gopalsamy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He is referring to what happened in the morning.

श्री शरद यादव : गोपालसामी जी की सवेरे की बात है । तमिलनाडु में जिनकी सरकार है, ए० डी० एम० के० उनका विरोध भी आपके सामने आया जब कि वे पहले इसके समर्थन में थ । जिन लोगों के लिए वे वहां गए उन लोगों की हत्या कर रहे हैं और उनकी सम्पत्ति को बरबाद कर रहे हैं । सभापति जी , वहां से जो खबरें आ रही हैं उसके अनुसार तमिलियन जो लोग बसे हुए हैं उनके 12–12 साल के बच्चे हमारी फौज से लड़ रहे हैं और हमारे फौज के आदमियों की भी बड़े पैमाने पर हत्यायें हो रही हैं । तो मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी से पूछना चाहता हूं कि इस अकार्ड से कौन सा फायदा हमारे राष्ट्रीय हित के काम का होने वाला है यह वे बताने की कृपा करें ।

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I must say that most of the questions seem to have got lost in the padding that was put around them. I will still try and locate what I could find and try and answer them.

First, I would like to make a few general points. Like I have said in the statements, there are three basic aspects that we have to keep in mind. None is more or less important than the other. At one time one could have more importance at another time another could have more importance.

The three are—the interests of the Tamil people in Sri Lanka. Not just one faction of the Tamil people, not one small district of Sri Lanka, we are talking of the Tamils all over Sri Lanka and the majority Tamils in Jaffna also. The LTTE does not represent the majority of Tamils in any way and we must not make a mistake of counting the LTTE as representing Tamil opinion, or the demands of

[Shri Rajiv Gandhi]

LTTE as the demands of the Tamil people. There are many....

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Two-thirds of your statement concentrates on LTTE. We do not do it. You have given importance to the LTTE.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Jaswant Singh, you have asked your clarifications. Now please hear the Prime Minister.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: When did he realise that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: When you people were speaking nobody interfered. Now please hear him.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: There must be no confusion between the Tamils in Sri Lanka, even the Tamils in Jaffna, and the LTTE. Let me be very clear that the IPKF is not fighting with the Tamils of Jaffna, or of anywhere else. The IPKF is only disarming the LTTE which can be numbered, which can be counted. These are not numbers in lakhs, like the Tamils are.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: What is the identification?

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: Mr. Jaswant Singh, you have had your opportunity. I do not wish to debate with you across the floor.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Kindly see, nobody interfered when you were speaking; otherwise it would have been difficult. I kept all of them quiet. Now you please hear him. You will get an opportunity day after tomorrow if you still have to raise some points.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: The first problem is the question as to what are the rightful demands of the Tamils in Sri Lanka, what they must have to live in honour and peace and security to work in honour and peace and security in Sri Lanka.

The second question that has to be addressed is the unity and integrity of Sri Lanka. It is not in our interest, or, we feel, in anybody's interest, if a country so close to India distintegrates on ethnic lines, or divides into two countries on ethnic lines. We must keep that in mind.

The third is our own security concerns in the region. The third point is no less important than the first two, and I will request the hon. Members, especially among the Opposition, to keep that in mind. I am glad that one Member did raise this question and the repercussions of what could happen if right solutions were not found in Sri Lanka, and I am thankful to him. We must keep all these three things in mind when we look for a solution.

The second point that I would like to take up is the aspersion that has been cast on our armed forces. I feel ashamed to stand on the floor of the same House where Members are casting such aspersions on our armed forces—and I take very strong objection. Let me say categorically that the Indian armed forces are second to none in this world—second to none in discipline, second to none in their fighting capacity and second to none in their morale. I wish Members would think about the consequences of the type of aspersions that they have made on the floor today. I am sad and distressed that Members elected to such high office can shamelessly talk in this manner about our armed forces. It is a sad day, Sir.

The third point that I would like to go to immediately is that of the talks that we have had with the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu, Shri M. G. Ramachandaran. We have kept Shri Ramachandran in the picture right through and we have had continuous consultation. Various Ministers at various times had gone to Madras to talk to him and on some occasions he had come to Delhi to talk with us. It has been a continuing process over a long period. Let me assure honourable Members, even the Members from his own party who are here, that there are no differences between

the attitudes of our Government and the attitudes of Shri M. G. Ramachandran I am saying that correct as of this morning, about ten o'clock. If something has happened between ten o'clock and six o'clock, now, I am sorry I am not aware of that yet. Perhaps the honourable Member could advise me of that....(*Interruptions*)... I met him in Washington and we had a long meeting. He had been away from India for a long time and, when you are away, various types of things filter through which, perhaps, are not always the entire truth. I discussed all our worries about the way things were going. I expressed the positive aspects of what had been achieved and he was fully satisfied about the direction that the Government was taking. I am very confident that even now there is absolutely no difference between the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu and this Government.

Some Members have asked for a ceasefire. I have said very clearly that we are willing to have a ceasefire. But, basically there is one condition—that they must come along with the Agreement, and built into that condition is the condition that they must give up violence, surrender their arms and all the other things that follow from that. There is only that one condition.

One honourable Member even mentioned Bangladesh, and I appreciate what he said about Indiraji at that time. I would like to point out, though, that the ceasefire that India ordered was after an unconditional surrender by the forces of Pakistan when they sat at a table and signed a paper. Let us not forget that.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: That can happend now.

...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: We have, at the moment, no proposition from the LTTE suggesting a ceasefire and coming on to accepting the Agreement or surrendering weapons, contrary to what many Members on the floor of this House have said.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: Mr. Sivagnanam has written. But others have also written. It has come in the papers.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: If you have listened to what I have said, I have been very clear in what I have said.

Now, to go to some of the other points that were raised, one member talked about the contents of the statement that we were going to make. I had not disclosed or discussed the contents of the statement with anybody. The statement was drafted by us this morning, and we finished the drafting only at about I o'clock or perhaps a little later, and there was no question of giving any directions on what we were going to say. We only said that we were going to make a statement on the situation in Sri Lanka, and we have done so. If you look at the statement, there is a paragraph there which very clearly covers all the aspects of our discussions with the President of Sri Lanka. If you like, I can read it out to you. It says:

> "The matter was discused extensively with President Jayewardene in Kathmandu and during his three day working visit to Delhi."

This covers some of the other questions:

> "We have received firm assurances that if, over the coming months, difficulties arise, the Sri Lanka Government will make such changes as are found necessary."

We are satisfied with the re-assurance that the Prsident has given us, and I am sure that we will not have a problem in getting complete implementation of this Agreement.

I am sorry, there is one more point. I want to go back to the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu. Let me be very clear that, to the best of my knowledge, the Tamil Nadu Government has not been involved in the passing over or helping in any way in arms and weapons of the LTTE or any other group. The Tamil Nadu Government has looked after the refugees. They have given humanitarian aid. Everything

[Shri Rajiv Gandhi]

to help the human beings, yes. To the best of my knowledge weapons arms anything related to war and violence, to the best of my knowledge, no.

श्री शरद यादव : आर्म्स किसने दिये;

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Prime Minister for this clarification. That is all.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I thank the hon. Member for thanking me.

But, I would like to point out that the words that that hon. Members has mentioned on the floor of this House do nothing but try to substantiate what President Jayewardene has said. I would request him just to think about what he has said. I am repudiating what has been said. It was not correct. Perhaps, it was a mistaken information or whatever it was. I do not want to go into the details of that. But I would like to state categorically to the best of Government of India's knowledge, there has been no involvement of the Tamil Nadu Government or any other State Government in supporting through arms, weapons or any other thing which could end in violence.

Some of the other points that were raised are:

One Member talked about the fast, Mr. Thileepan's fast. Yes, we did request on many occasions that the fast should be given up. Our High Commissioner made repeated requests to Mr. Prabhakaran, and especially the requests were made because the demands that were being were under discussion, and we were confident that they would be given because that was the trend of the discussions. The demands were given, they were acceded to. But, unfortunately, the attitudes that were taken were totally negative.

Here again, another Member asked whether these things were recorded and whether they were signed. Yes, minutes were kept. They were signed by the LTTE leader, Mr. Mahathiya and Mr. Puri on our side. I might be wrong in pronunciation.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: They did not sign the accord.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: I did not say "accord." Let me go for a minute to the interim Administrative Council which was also raised by a number of Members. Discussions took place. The LTTE was allowed to withdraw and change these names till the last minute. Till the time it was announced they were allowed to change the names and withdraw the names and shuttle around. But after it was announced, they still wanted to do it. Even after it was announced, changes were accepted, except they wanted after the announcement to have the Chairman changed. The Chairman was chosen out of a panel of names given by the LTTE. The Chairman chosen was Sivagnanam, the same gentleman that was mentioned just now by the hon. Member here. Now, there has to be some honour in dealing and in talking. The LTTE has not shown this. It is impossible to deal with people who do not talk or stand on their word.

Many have asked us to unilaterally do this or take LTTE's word for that. That LTTE has categorically demonstrated that it is not willing to stick to anything. How can we take their word for anything? Secondly, we cannot be giving different indications to the IPKF. Once the IPKF has been told that the LTTE is to be disarmed, the IPKF will be told to stop only after they have disarmed or only when they categorically come on line that we stand by the Agreement and we are going to surrender arms and certain other minor technical things that the IPKF themselves need. There is nothing, let me assure this House, for the LTTE to keep on sending telegrams to Tamil Nadu and other places. They can get in touch with the IPKF quicker and they can get message to Delhi. Let me assure them that if they approach the IPKF saying categorically that they are willing to come along with the Agreement, that they are willing to surrender their weapons and

meet some of the technical problems on the ground, problems that the IPKF might face, the IPKF will cease fire immediately. The ball is very clearly in the LTTE court. If they want a cease-fire, let them go to the IPKF commander and tell them 'We are ready here itself. There is no problem. There are no communication links missing. It is possible and it can be done in 30 minutes. So, let us not get caught in all this. These are only tactics to try and sow a division in this House, to demoralise IPKF. And that is what hon. Members have done today. I am ashamed.

One Member said that the LTTE did not agree in July when the Agreement was due to be signed. I had a long discussion about this with some Members of the Opposition who, if I remember rightly, did not boycott the meeting which I called. And if you had come in that meeting, you would have noted all these points which were covered in great detail at that time. And if you want even now—I will not take the time of the House—I will give you in great detail what we discussed, how we discussed, what LTTE wanted, what EROS wanted, what TULF and others wanted. Every single thing that they asked for before I signed that Agreement has been fulfilled. There were no gaps at all. The only one point which we have not agreed to, and we will not agree to, is the formation of Eelam as a separate country. We said no and we will stick by that thing. But apart from that every single thing that was raised at any time by the Tamils, much more than that, and even the things that were raised later and which had nothing to do with the earlier problem, but were to do with the future problems—what will happen of development, what will happen of political set up, how will the administration run, these sorts of things, which were forward looking questions—each and every one of these was answered. One Member said that there was U.S. pressure behind it. I think the best response has already come from some hon. Member and I hardly need to comment on it. India does not react to pressure, let me be very clear. There was no pressure behind the Agreement. We have done what was best for Sri Lanka, what was best for the Tamils and most of all best for India.

Some Members raised the point of the 12 suicides and why we did not stop it. Yes, we took it up on a number of occasions. We tried very hard but unfortunately our advice was not heeded. We were not in control of the individuals because they had been picked upon the high seas on a boat and on a boat which was well armed with mounted machine guns, after the cease-fire has taken place and after the weapons have been surrendered. Well, it was unfortunate. And the suicide of the 12 was even more unfortunate. I could have understood if the Sri Lankans had tortured them or killed them or done something else to them. That could have resulted in violent repurcussions. But the suicide and the repurcussions, I think, need to be linked more closely and perhaps, we need to think about how they can connect.

I am not very clear but one Member from the Opposite Benches talked about the division in the Government. I heard "in the Rajiv Gandhi Government."

AN HON. MEMBER: Jayewardene's Government.

SHRI RAJIV GANDHI: I would also request you to correct it in the record.

We have not been offered any treaty of friendship or any draft. We have not seen anything like this. So I would rather not comment on it. We have not seen it.

One Member talked specifically about the Crown lands, about the ethnic ratio and all that. I think one of the hon. Members has got the photo copy and if she goes two clauses after the clause she talked about she will see them that it is well safeguarded in these two clauses. I think it is clause 2.6 and 2.7, if I remember correctly and not clause 2.5 what she has talked about. But that whole paragraph has been discussed with a number of Tamil groups at every stage and that has been accepted by all the Tamil groups. There is no problem at all on the aspect of that. I think, I have covered all the points that have been raised. (*Interruptions*) I have

[Shri Rajiv Gandhi]

only one more complaint to make and that is even when I read the little paragraph about sending our support to the Armed Forces and about sending the condolences to the bereaved families, we did not get support from the Opposition. I hope at least on this point, you will support us. Thank you, Mr Chairman.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: You are responsible for that. You have to apologise for that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, Shri Hanspal to continue the discussion. (*Interruptions*) Today you have agreed that it will be passed today. It was a solemn agreement by all the Opposition parties.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: But three statements came even without prior notice. What can we do?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Only point is, put to vote.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI (Madhya Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, Sir, we agreed and we stand by the commitment. But I have just enquired from the Home Minister and he says that it can be passed even tomorrow. If there was a deadline that it has to be passed today. We would certainly do it. We stand by the commitment but I have been told by the Home Minister because it is the 11th that is the last day and therefore, he agrees.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES AND PENSIONS AND THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM): Sir, if hon. Members well agree that immediately after Question Hour, this will be taken up and you will also impose a time limit, I am agreeable to have this debate resumed tomorrow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good. This should be the spirit. So, we rise to meet again tomorrow, the 10th November, 1987 at 11 A.M.

The House then adjourned at thirty-one minutes past six of the clock till eleven of the clock on Tuesday, the 10th November, 1987.

GIPMARND—RS I—1183 RS 18-12-1987.